

Appln. No. 10/635,629  
Amdt. dated: March 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated December 10, 2004

### **Remarks/Arguments**

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated December 10, 2004.  
This reply is timely filed.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 8, 11-16 and 18 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 7, 9, 10, 17 and 19-20 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. The rejections are set out in more detail below.

#### **I. Double Patenting**

Claims 1-6, 8, 11-16 and 18 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/421,352. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.130, please find the enclosed terminal disclaimer which complies with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) and overcomes the provisional rejections. Please charge Deposit Acct. 50-2884 in amount of \$130 pursuant to Fee Code 1814. Also enclosed is a Statement Under 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b). Applicants therefore respectfully request that the provisional rejections be withdrawn.

#### **II. Claim Objections**

Claims 7, 9, 10, 17 and 19-20 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. As noted, a terminal disclosure statement is enclosed to overcome the provisional rejection of the base claim and any intervening claims, which renders the objection moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **III. Conclusion**


{00004122;}

Appln. No. 10/635,629  
Amdt. dated: March 3, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated December 10, 2004

It is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

3-3-05  
Date



Robert J. Sacco  
Registration No. 35,667  
Terry W. Forsythe  
Registration No. 47,569  
SACCO & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
P.O. Box 30999  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33420-0999  
Tel: 561-626-2222

{00004122;}